

Radiative and nonleptonic hyperon decays in broken $SU(3)$

P. Żenczykowski^{a*}

^aDivision of Theoretical Physics, Institute of Nuclear Physics, Polish Academy of Sciences, Radzikowskiego 152, 31-342 Kraków, Poland

We report on the recently proposed joint resolution of two long-standing puzzles in weak radiative (WR) and nonleptonic (NL) hyperon decays (HD). First, a good VMD-based description of WRHD is presented. In particular, the large negative asymmetry observed in the $\Sigma^+ \rightarrow p\gamma$ decay is explained through a calculably large $SU(3)$ -breaking effect in the relevant parity-violating amplitude. Second, the achieved description of the parity-violating WRHD amplitudes permits the extraction, via the $SU(2)_W + \text{VMD}$ route, of the non-soft-pion correction term in the parity-violating NLHD amplitudes. The latter subtracts a substantial amount from the current-algebra commutator term, thus leading to the resolution of the old $S : P$ discrepancy in NLHD.

1. THE PUZZLES

For a long time weak hyperon decays have presented us with two puzzles: the problem of the $S : P$ ratio in nonleptonic decays and the issue of a large negative asymmetry in the $\Sigma^+ \rightarrow p\gamma$ radiative decay.

1.1. The $S : P$ problem

The $S : P$ puzzle is about 50 years old. It concerns the relative size of parity-violating (p.v., S -wave) and parity-conserving (p.c., P -wave) amplitudes in nonleptonic hyperon decays such as $\Sigma^+ \rightarrow p\pi^0$ etc. Each of the two sets of amplitudes may be described in terms of two $SU(3)$ amplitudes: f and d . Their experimental values, as determined in [1], are (in units of $10^{-5}MeV$) - in the p.c. sector:

$$f_P = 4.7, \quad d_P = -2.6, \quad (1)$$

and in the p.v. sector:

$$f_S = 3.0, \quad d_S = -1.2. \quad (2)$$

Consequently, we have:

$$d_P/d_S \approx 2.2 \quad f_P/d_P \approx -1.8 \quad f_S/d_S \approx -2.5 \quad (3)$$

This constitutes *Puzzle #1*, since the soft-pion theorems [2] predict that $f_S = f_P$ and $d_S = d_P$.

*This work was supported in part by the Polish State Committee for Scientific Research Grant No. 2 P03B 046 25.

1.2. Large negative asymmetry in $\Sigma^+ \rightarrow p\gamma$

The $\Sigma^+ \rightarrow p\gamma$ puzzle dates back to the 1960's. It is composed of several ingredients:

(A) Hara's theorem [3] states that "Parity-violating $\Sigma^+ \rightarrow p\gamma$ amplitude must vanish in the $SU(3)$ limit". Thus, with $SU(3)$ -breaking effects expected to contribute at the 20% level, one anticipates small asymmetry $|\alpha(\Sigma^+ \rightarrow p\gamma)| \approx 0.2$.

(B) This expectation is in disagreement with experiment: $\alpha_{exp}(\Sigma^+ \rightarrow p\gamma) = -0.76 \pm 0.08$.

(C) In addition, there are several conflicts between the three main types of theoretical approaches to the p.v. WRHD amplitudes:

1. The hadron-level pole model (with $1/2^-$ baryons in the intermediate state) [4] agrees with Hara's theorem in the $SU(3)$ limit, while for broken $SU(3)$ it yields $\alpha(\Sigma^+ \rightarrow p\gamma) \approx -0.8$, despite expectations in (A).
2. The simple quark model [5] violates Hara's theorem in the $SU(3)$ limit, and yields $\alpha(\Sigma^+ \rightarrow p\gamma) \approx -0.6$ for broken $SU(3)$.
3. The hadron-level VMD+ $SU(6)$ model [6] violates Hara's theorem in the $SU(3)$ limit, and yields $\alpha(\Sigma^+ \rightarrow p\gamma) \approx -0.9$ for broken $SU(3)$.

The issue of the violation of Hara's theorem and the above theoretical conflicts constitute *Puzzle #2*.

2. CRUCIAL EXPERIMENTAL INPUT

In ref.[7] it was observed that the status of Hara's theorem may be clarified through a measurement of the $\alpha(\Xi^0 \rightarrow \Lambda\gamma)$ asymmetry. The analyses of [7] show that, independently of whether one adopts an approach in which Hara's theorem is satisfied or violated in the $SU(3)$ limit, the absolute value of this asymmetry must be large (around 0.8), and the theoretical error of this estimate must be small (around ± 0.15) even for strong $SU(3)$ breaking effects. As shown in Table 1, the sign of this asymmetry indicates then what happens in the $SU(3)$ limit. Theoretical errors of other asymmetries (whose signs are gathered in Table 1) are larger than in the $\Xi^0 \rightarrow \Lambda\gamma$ case, and depend on model details. In particular, the $\Lambda \rightarrow n\gamma$ decay cannot provide reliable information permitting to discriminate between the models: the relevant theoretical amplitudes involve substantial cancellations, thus being prone to sizable errors, while the experimental determination of the corresponding asymmetry is extremely difficult. Theoretical estimates also show that the $\Xi^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^0\gamma$ asymmetry should be negative and fairly large (between -0.5 to -1.0), independently of the status of Hara's theorem.

Table 1
Theoretical signs of asymmetries in WRHD for broken $SU(3)$

Hara's theorem in the $SU(3)$ limit:	satisfied	violated
$\Sigma^+ \rightarrow p\gamma$	—	—
$\Lambda \rightarrow n\gamma$	—	+
$\Xi^0 \rightarrow \Lambda\gamma$	-0.8 ± 0.15	$+0.8 \pm 0.15$
$\Xi^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^0\gamma$	—	—

Recent NA48 measurements [8] have yielded:

$$\alpha(\Xi^0 \rightarrow \Lambda\gamma) = -0.78 \pm 0.19, \quad (4)$$

thus proving that Hara's theorem is true in the $SU(3)$ limit. This leaves the following two theoretical questions to be answered:

- 1) what is wrong with the theoretical calculations predicting the violation of Hara's theorem,
- 2) how (moderate) $SU(3)$ breaking can result in the large $\Sigma^+ \rightarrow p\gamma$ asymmetry.

3. WRHD: THEORETICAL RESOLUTION

It appears that the origins of the violation of Hara's theorem in the simple quark model [5] and in the VMD+ $SU(6)$ approach [6] are different.

Quark model calculations of ref.[5] and its sequels violate confinement: in the $SU(3)$ limit, the quark propagating between the actions of the weak and electromagnetic Hamiltonians enters its mass shell and, consequently, it propagates to infinity, away from the other two quarks [9]. Thus, the violation of Hara's theorem in the simple quark model is an artefact of the approach.

It is more difficult to identify the origin of the violation of Hara's theorem in the VMD+ $SU(6)$ approach of [6]. Indeed, as the latter deals with hadrons only, no violation of confinement may be even contemplated here. However, any VMD+ $SU(6)$ approach is based on a connection between the weak couplings of pseudoscalar and vector mesons to baryons, i.e. on an understanding of how the nonleptonic hyperon decays are linked to weak couplings of vector mesons to baryons. A detailed analysis [11] shows that the particular form of the connection between the relevant p.v. weak couplings, established in [10] for the needs of nuclear parity violation (mainly for the evaluation of the weak p.v. ρNN couplings) and used both in [6] and in other papers, is erroneous, as briefly explained below.

3.1. Soft-pion approximation in NLHD

In general, the p.v. NLHD amplitudes may be decomposed into a sum of two terms, the current algebra commutator term and the correction term vanishing in the soft-pion limit. Under the assumption than in the real world the emitted pion is still sufficiently soft so that the correction term may be neglected, the p.v. NLHD amplitudes are given by the commutator term only. This is the assumption used in [10] when evaluating the weak couplings of pseudoscalar mesons to baryons. The corresponding weak couplings of vector mesons to baryons are then evaluated by spin symmetry. When VMD is added, violation of Hara's theorem and the related prediction of $\alpha(\Xi^0 \rightarrow \Lambda\gamma) \approx +0.8$ ensues.

3.2. Non-soft-pion correction term

A thorough analysis of how pions and vector mesons couple to other hadrons in the presence of weak interactions shows that the commutator term in the p.v. NLHD amplitudes has no counterpart in the p.v. weak couplings of vector mesons to baryons (see e.g.[2],[11]). This is so because the connection between the pseudoscalar meson field and the axial current is different from the connection between the vector meson field and the vector current. As a result, any non-zero weak p.v. coupling of vector mesons to baryons must be related via spin symmetry to the non-soft-pion correction term in the p.v. NLHD amplitudes [11]. Symmetry properties of the non-soft-pion term determine then the corresponding properties of its spin-symmetry-related vector-meson counterpart. When VMD is added, these properties ensure both that Hara's theorem is satisfied and that $\alpha(\Xi^0 \rightarrow \Lambda\gamma) \approx -0.8$.

4. WRHD IN BROKEN $SU(3)$

The qualitative explanation given above was recently backed up by a model calculation where $SU(3)$ symmetry breaking was explicitly taken into account [12].

Ref.[12] uses the $SU(3)$ -breaking pole model for the p.c. NLHD amplitudes, and extracts the P-wave parameters f_P and d_P from the data. The extracted values are $f_P = 5.8 \times 10^{-5}$ and $d_P = -3 \times 10^{-5}$ (comparison with Eq.(1) indicates the size of expected errors). Application of spin symmetry and VMD leads to parameter-free predictions for the p.c. WRHD amplitudes.

Data on the WRHD branching ratios and asymmetries, when supplied with the above-determined p.c. WRHD amplitudes and the $SU(3)$ -breaking pole model for the p.v. WRHD amplitudes, permit the extraction of the parameters describing the latter amplitudes. The relevant parameters (defined in [12], see also Section 5), corresponding to two-quark (b_R) and single-quark (s_R) contributions, are (in units of 10^{-7}):

$$b_R \approx 5.3, \quad s_R \approx -0.75 \quad (5)$$

Description of the WRHD data achieved with these parameters is given in Tables 2 and 3.

When judging the description of WRHD given in Tables 2 and 3, one has to consider the facts that the branching ratios of the $\Sigma^+ \rightarrow p\gamma$ and $\Lambda \rightarrow n\gamma$ decays are sensitive both to the details of the $SU(3)$ breaking effects and to various cancellations, and that the observed discrepancies correspond to errors of the order of 20% at the amplitude level. Analyses [7] show that the comparison of data and the model is most reliable for the $\Xi^0 \rightarrow \Lambda\gamma$ decay.

Table 2

WRHD branching ratios

	data ([13],[8])	model ([12])
$\Sigma^+ \rightarrow p\gamma$	1.23 ± 0.05	0.72
$\Lambda \rightarrow n\gamma$	1.75 ± 0.15	0.77
$\Xi^0 \rightarrow \Lambda\gamma$	1.16 ± 0.08	1.02
$\Xi^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^0\gamma$	3.33 ± 0.10	4.42
$\Xi^- \rightarrow \Sigma^-\gamma$	0.127 ± 0.023	0.16

Table 3

WRHD asymmetries

	data ([13],[8])	model ([12])
$\Sigma^+ \rightarrow p\gamma$	-0.76 ± 0.08	-0.67
$\Lambda \rightarrow n\gamma$		-0.93
$\Xi^0 \rightarrow \Lambda\gamma$	-0.78 ± 0.19	-0.97
$\Xi^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^0\gamma$	-0.63 ± 0.09	-0.92
$\Xi^- \rightarrow \Sigma^-\gamma$	$+1.0 \pm 1.3$	+0.80

The size of the $SU(3)$ breaking effects is controlled by the dependence of the p.v. WRHD amplitudes on the value of the $SU(3)$ -breaking parameter $x \equiv \Delta m_s / \Delta\omega \approx 1/3$, where $\Delta m_s \approx 190 \text{ MeV}$ is an estimate of the strange-nonstrange quark mass difference, and $\Delta\omega \approx 570 \text{ MeV}$ is an estimate of the mass difference between the $1/2^+$ and $1/2^-$ baryons.

Table 4 shows relative sizes of the dominant two-quark contributions in the $SU(3)$ symmetric ($x = 0$) and $SU(3)$ breaking ($x = 1/3$) cases. Note that while the $SU(3)$ breaking effects for the relevant Ξ^0 amplitudes are of the order of 30%, the corresponding change in the size of the $\Sigma^+ \rightarrow p\gamma$ amplitude is enormous. Indeed, the $SU(3)$ -breaking contribution to the latter amplitude is of the same order of magnitude as the $SU(3)$ -symmetric contributions in the $\Lambda \rightarrow n\gamma$, $\Xi^0 \rightarrow \Lambda\gamma$ and $\Xi^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^0\gamma$ amplitudes. This completes the resolution of *Puzzle #2*.

Table 4
Relative size of two-quark contribution to p.v.
WRHD amplitudes ([12])

	SU(3) exact	SU(3) broken
$\Sigma^+ \rightarrow p\gamma$	0	+0.196
$\Lambda \rightarrow n\gamma$	+0.192	+0.048
$\Xi^0 \rightarrow \Lambda\gamma$	-0.192	-0.128
$\Xi^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^0\gamma$	-0.333	-0.5

5. NON-SOFT-PION TERMS IN NLHD

When VMD and spin symmetry are taken into account, parameters b_R and s_R describing the p.v. WRHD amplitudes are related to the non-soft-pion correction terms in NLHD. For $SU(3)$ symmetric denominators in the $1/2^-$ pole model, the modified connection between the S - and P -wave amplitudes is: $f_S = f_P + f_R$, $d_S = d_P + d_R$, where amplitudes $f_{S(P)}$, $d_{S(P)}$ (corrections f_R , d_R) are related to the two-quark $b_{S(P)}$ and single-quark $c_{S(P)}$ (b_R , c_R) amplitudes through [12]

$$b = 4d/F_\pi, \quad c = 6(f + d)/F_\pi \quad (6)$$

with $F_\pi = 94 \text{ MeV}$.

In terms of the two-quark and single-quark amplitudes b and c , the soft-pion prediction $f_S = f_P$, $d_S = d_P$ then reads

$$b_S = b_P, \quad c_S = c_P. \quad (7)$$

For the values of f, d from Eqs (1,2), the above equations read (in units of 10^{-7})

$$-5 \approx -11.1, \quad 12 \approx 13.4. \quad (8)$$

While c_R is not identical to s_R , the smallness of single-quark (s_R) effects in WRHD suggests the neglect of c_R [12]. For broken $SU(3)$ and with the non-soft-pion term, Eq.(7) is then modified to

$$b_S = b_P + b_R/(1 + x) \quad c_S \approx c_P \quad (9)$$

which for $x = 1/3$ reads

$$-5 \approx -6.6, \quad 12 \approx 13.4. \quad (10)$$

For the $SU(3)$ case with $x = 0$, one obtains

$$d_P/d_S \approx 2 \quad f_P/d_P \approx -1.8 \quad f_S/d_S \approx -2.6 \quad (11)$$

in excellent agreement with Eq.(3). Thus, the differences between the values of f and d as evaluated from S - and P - wave amplitudes result

mainly from the two-quark contribution to the non-soft-pion correction term. In this way, *Puzzle #1* is related to the fact that the WRHD amplitudes are dominated by the two-quark terms.

6. CONCLUSIONS

Simultaneous explanation of the size of $SU(3)$ breaking in the $\Sigma^+ \rightarrow p\gamma$ p.v. amplitude and of the difference between the values of the S - and P -wave $SU(3)$ parameters in the NLHD amplitudes indicates that weak hyperon decays have been finally understood. However, this understanding indicates at the same time that there might be a problem in the description of nuclear parity violation as the standard approach [10] uses an erroneous connection between the weak couplings of pseudoscalar and vector mesons to baryons.

REFERENCES

1. J. E. Donoghue, E. Golowich, and B. Holstein, Phys. Rep. **131**, 319 (1986).
2. M. Gell-Mann, Physics **1**, 63 (1964); S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **16**, 879 (1966); S. Adler and R. Dashen, *Current Algebras* (Benjamin, New York, 1968).
3. Y. Hara, Phys. Rev. Lett. **12**, 378 (1964).
4. M. B. Gavela *et al.* Phys. Lett. **101B**, 417 (1981).
5. A. N. Kamal and Riazuddin, Phys. Rev. D **28**, 2317 (1983).
6. P. Żenczykowski, Phys. Rev. D **40**, 2290 (1989).
7. J. Lach and P. Żenczykowski, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **10**, 3817 (1995).
8. A. Lai *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **584**, 251 (2004); (see also NA48 results in these proceedings).
9. P. Żenczykowski, Acta Phys. Pol. B **32**, 85 (2001).
10. B. Desplanques, J. F. Donoghue, and B. Holstein, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **124**, 449 (1980).
11. P. Żenczykowski, Acta Phys. Pol. B **34**, 2683 (2003); Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **115**, 24 (2003).
12. P. Żenczykowski, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 076005 (2006).
13. S. Eidelman *et al.* (Particle Data Group), Phys. Lett. B **592**, 1 (2004).